

Extending the Calculus of Constructions with Tarski's fix-point theorem

Yves Bertot

INRIA Sophia Antipolis

Abstract. We propose to use Tarski's least fixpoint theorem as a basis to define recursive functions in the calculus of inductive constructions. This widens the class of functions that can be modeled in type-theory based theorem proving tool to potentially non-terminating functions. This is only possible if we extend the logical framework by adding the axioms that correspond to classical logic. We claim that the extended framework makes it possible to reason about terminating and non-terminating computations and we show that common facilities of the calculus of inductive construction, like program extraction can be extended to also handle the new functions.

1 Introduction

For theoretical computer scientists, Tarski's least fix-point theorem is a simple basic block to assert the existence of objects defined by recursive equations. These objects may be inductive types and recursive functions [10,9]. However, to use this theorem, one needs to express that the domain of interest indeed has the required completeness property and that the function being considered indeed is continuous. If the goal is to define a partial recursive function, then this requires using axioms of classical logic, and for this reason the step is seldom taken in the user community of type-theory based theorem proving. However, the constructive prejudice is not a necessity: adding classical logic axioms to the constructive logic that is naturally provided by type theory can often be done safely, in a way that makes it possible to retain the consistency of the whole system.

In this paper, we suggest working in the setting of classical logic to increase our capability to reason about potentially non-terminating recursive functions. No inconsistency is introduced in the process, because potentially non-terminating functions of type $A \rightarrow B$ are actually modeled as functions of type $A \rightarrow B_{\perp}$: the fact that a function may not terminate is recorded in its type, non-terminating computations are given the value \perp which is distinguished from all the regular values, and one can reason classically about the fact that a function terminates or not. This is obviously non-constructive but does not introduce any inconsistency.

One of the advantages of type-theory based theorem proving is that actual programs can be derived from formal models, with guarantees that these

programs satisfy properties that are predicted in formally verified proofs. This derivation process, known as extraction [18,12], performs a cleaning operation so that all parts of the formal models that correspond to compile-time verifications are removed. Thanks to this cleaning operation the extracted programs may actually be reasonably efficient.

In the absence of classical logic axioms, type theory already makes it possible to model potentially non-terminating functions as total terminating functions with an extra argument, where this extra argument explicitly states that the input actually belongs to the function’s domain of definition [4]. In the formal model of an algorithm, a potentially non-terminating function can thus only be invoked if one proves that the particular input for this invocation is indeed in the domain definition. Once extracted in a conventional programming language, this ensures that extracted pieces of software using these partial functions do use them only when termination is ensured. It is still possible to use the extracted functions outside their domain of definition by deliberately calling them from the toplevel, but inner uses of the function are guaranteed to terminate.

When axioms are added to the logical framework, three cases may occur: first, the new axioms may make the system inconsistent; second, the new axioms may be used only in the part of the models that will be cleaned away by the extraction process; third, the axioms may be used in the part of the models that is extracted in the derived programs. We don’t really need to discuss the first case that should be avoided at all costs. In the second case, the extraction process still produces a consistent program, with the same guarantee of termination and this guarantee relies on reasoning steps that belong to classical logic, which is acceptable as long as the whole framework remains consistent. In the third case, the added axiom needs to be linked to a piece of software that implements the behavior predicted by the axiom. We claim that this can be done safely if Tarski’s least fix-point theorem is added as an axiom to the basic calculus of inductive constructions, along with other axioms to describe classical logic.

Tarski’s least fix-point theorem can be used to justify the existence of recursive functions, because these functions can be described as the least fix-point of the functional¹ that arises in their recursive equation. However, it is necessary to ensure that the function space has the properties of a complete partial order and that the functional is continuous. These facts can be motivated using a simple development of basic domain theory. With the help of a variant of the axiom of choice, this theorem can be used to produce a function, which we shall call **Tarski_fix**, that takes as argument a functional and a proof that this functional is continuous and returns a recursive function, which is the least fix-point of this functional. This recursive function can then be combined with other algorithms to build larger software models.

With respect to extraction, we propose a program written in the target functional language that cannot be described in the constructive part of the calculus of inductive constructions and can be used as the target code for every use of the function **Tarski_fix**. We also suggest a few improvements to the extraction

¹ We consistently use the word *functional* as a noun to describe a higher-order function.

process that should help make sure that fairly efficient code can be obtained automatically from the formal models studied inside our extension of the calculus of inductive constructions.

From the formal proof point of view, Tarski's least fix-point theorem provides two important properties for the function it produces. The first property is that the result function satisfies the fix-point equation used to define it. This fix-point equation is important to express how the computation evolves in one step of recursion. We already advocated the importance of fix-point equations in previous work [2]. This fix-point equation is useful when we want to prove that under some conditions a function is guaranteed to terminate. The second property is that the result function is the least fix-point of the functional of interest. As a corollary, it is also the least upper bound of a sequence of functions that is obtained by iterating the functional on the bottom element of the complete partial order $A \rightarrow B_\perp$. As such, it benefits from tools that make it possible to reason by induction on the length of computations, thus providing what is called *fix-point* induction in [21]. This makes it possible to prove properties of the result of functions when it exists, it can also be used to prove that under some conditions a function will fail to terminate.

In this paper, we recapitulate an easy proof of Tarski's least fix-point theorem. We show how the conditions of applicability of this theorem can be proved for the formal description of potentially non-terminating recursive functions, we then describe an small example. In particular, this example contain proofs about recursive functions as a support to discuss the techniques that are available. The next section discusses matters related to extraction and execution of the recursive programs that are thus obtained. Related work and opportunities for further extensions are reviewed at the end of the paper. All the experiments described in this paper were done with coq [7,3] and can be found on the internet from the author's web page².

2 Proving the fix-point theorem

The statement of the theorem we are interested in is the following:

Theorem 1. *In a complete partial order with a minimal element, every continuous function has a fix-point.*

This is the form that is found in courses on programming language semantics like [14,21]. We formalized the easy proof that is found in [14], in the calculus of inductive constructions without axioms. Thus, this theorem is part of constructive mathematics when we are in a type that can constructively be described as a complete partial order.

To make sense from this theorem's statement, we need to describe the meaning of the various concepts. A *complete* partial order is a partial order (a type

² The current address prefix is <http://www-sop.inria.fr/marelle/Yves.Bertot>, the proofs are available through the file `proofs.html`.

with a binary relation that is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive), with the extra property that every *chain* has a least upper bound, where a chain is a sequence u_n such that $\forall n, R\ u_n\ u_{n+1}$; it is a trivial matter to show that the least upper bound of a sequence, when it exists, is unique. A *continuous* function is a function that preserves least upper bounds: continuous functions are always considered between two complete partial orders (A, R) and (B, R') . The function f is called continuous if for every chain u_n in (A, R) , when u is its least upper bound, then $f(u)$ is the least upper bound of the sequence $f(u_n)$. This definition does not require that the function f should be monotonic, but we proved that continuous functions are necessarily monotonic.

We actually proved the theorem in a context with a collection of local variables and hypotheses. These are summarized as: A is a Type, R is a binary relation, that is reflexive and antisymmetric (it is actually not required to be transitive) and complete, there is a minimal element \perp , and f is continuous. The statement we prove is the following one:

Theorem Tarski_least_fixpoint : $\exists\ \phi : A, \text{least_fixpoint } R\ f\ \phi$.

The proof is decomposed in five lemmas. First, we show that the sequence $u_n = f^n \perp$ is a chain (by induction on n), then we show that any upper bound u of u_n is also an upper bound of $f(u_n)$ (just by translating indices), and that $f(u)$ is an upper bound of u_n , (using the monotonicity of f and again by translating indices). Then we show that the least upper bound ϕ of u_n is a fix-point of f (since $f(\phi)$ is also an upper bound we have $R\ u_n\ f(u_n)$, by continuity $f(\phi)$ is a least upper bound of $f(u_n)$, but ϕ is also an upper bound of $f(u_n)$, and we conclude by antisymmetry). Then we show that any fix-point of f is necessarily an upper bound of u_n (by induction on n) and this is enough to conclude that the ϕ is the least fix-point of f .

An important corollary of this proof is that the least fix-point of f is also the least upper bound of the sequence $f^n \perp$. This is an important tool for subsequent proofs: this statement will be useful for the proofs by *fix-point* induction.

Specialists in the theory of the calculus of constructions will have noted that the existential construct in the theorem's statement is the statement of the sort **Prop**, so the function whose existence is asserted cannot be used to define other functions of sort **Set** or **Type**. To avoid this limitation, we can use a Σ -type version of the axiom of definite description to transform this existential statement into a Σ -type (based on the **sigT** constructor). This axiom is considered acceptable by specialists, but one should be careful as it is incompatible with the variant of the calculus of inductive constructions where the **Set** sort is impredicative [6]. Fortunately, this impredicative variant is not the default form provided in a prover like Coq and most work is usually done in a predicative setting.

3 Using the theorem to define recursive functions

To define recursive functions of type $A \rightarrow B$, we need to find a binary relation \subseteq such that $(A \rightarrow B, \subseteq)$ really is a complete partial order, and the definition of

the recursive function can be understood as a fix-point equation. The solution that is used in domain theory is to add artificially a minimal element to the type B and to choose an order structure so that the minimal element is minimal but any other elements are incomparable. In conventional programming languages, this is done easily using a unary `option` type constructor. In this paper, we will re-use this `option` type, with a constructor named `Some`, meant to carry a value of the original type and a constructor named `None`, which we shall use as the minimal element, sometimes noted \perp . In our mathematical notations, we shall write B_\perp for `option` B . Thus, `option` constructs a family of types parameterized by the initial type B . We then define a family of relations (also parameterized by the type B). This relation is named `option_cpo` in our experiment and will be noted \subseteq in this paper (hiding the parameter B when there is no ambiguity). The relation is then defined as the reflexive closure of the relation such that $\perp \subseteq x$ always holds. This family of relations is easily proved to be a family of complete partial orders.

For any type B , when R is a binary relation on B , we can *lift* the relation to any function space $A \rightarrow B$. This is simply done by *pointwise* transposition of the relation on B : f is in relation with g if $R(f(x), g(x))$ holds for every x in A . We will write $R_{A \rightarrow B}(f, g)$ or simply $R(f, g)$ when this is not ambiguous. If R is a complete partial order, it is easy to prove that $R_{A \rightarrow B}$ is reflexive and transitive, even in a purely constructive setting. However, to prove that $R_{A \rightarrow B}$ is antisymmetric, we need an axiom of extensionality, which is usually not provided in a constructive logical framework. This axiom simply states that two functions that are pointwise equal will be considered equal. This axiom is quite tame and we use it in our experiment without further question.

The next question is to show that lifting preserves completeness. Actually, when f_n is a chain of functions for $R_{A \rightarrow B}$, the values $f_n(x)$ when x is fixed constitute a chain in B . Since (B, R) is complete, this chain has a least upper bound and we can thus define a unique value v_x for every x which is the least upper bound of the chain $f_n(x)$. This should be enough to define a new function f that is the least upper bound of the chain f_n . However, going from the existence of v_x for every x to a function of x requires an extra axiom known as the axiom of definite description. It is considered to be a variant of the axiom of choice (or rather the axiom of unique choice). This axiom is also obviously non constructive. Still, we assume that this axiom can also be added to our logical framework without endangering the consistency of the system.

The axiom of definite description has the following statement: *for every relation on $A \times B$, if for every x in A , there is a unique y in B such that $R(x, y)$ holds, then there exists a function f such that for every x $R(x, f(x))$ holds.* To compute the least fix-point of a chain of functions f_n , we simply choose $R(x, y)$ to mean y is the least upper bound of the chain $f_n(x)$.

In general, we want to model a recursive function f of type $A \rightarrow B_\perp$ and we have to construct a continuous functional F of type $(A \rightarrow B_\perp) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B_\perp)$ so that $f = Ff$. From now on, we will write $f \subseteq g$ to mean the lifted order from the natural order on B_\perp . In our formal development this order will be called

`f_order` and we prove that it is a complete partial order. We then specialize the least fix-point theorem to obtain a function called `Tarski_fix` with the following type:

```
Tarski_fix:
  forall (A B:Set)(f:(A->option B)->A->option B)
    (Hct : continuous (f_order A B)(f_order A B) f),
    A->option B.
```

The first two arguments are usually not written when this function is used.

This function has a companion theorem to express that the function that is built is the least fix-point of the functional:

```
Theorem Tarski_fix_prop :
  forall (A B:Set) (f:(A -> option B)->A -> option B)
    (Hct: continuous (f_order A B)(f_order A B) f),
    least_fixpoint (f_order A B) f (Tarski_fix f Hct).
```

The next problem is to show that the functionals we encounter are continuous. In practice, our recursive functions will respect a smooth regularity: the value \perp is added to the result type to represent the fact that the function may not terminate. The condition of continuity on the functional F corresponds to this interpretation of “potential non termination”: every expression containing a potentially non-terminating computation should fail to terminate if it actually uses the value returned by this computation and that computation fails to terminate. To use the value of a potentially non-terminating computation one needs to write a pattern-matching construct on this computation: the continuity condition will be satisfied if we ensure that the \perp value is returned in the \perp case of this matching construct.

For example, if we want to define a factorial function we will construct a functional `F_fact` as follows:

```
Definition F_fact (fact:Z -> option Z) (x:Z) : option Z :=
  match Zeq x 0 with
  | true => Some 1
  | false =>
    match fact(x - 1) with
    | None => None
    | Some v => Some (x*v)
    end
  end.
```

The proof that this function is continuous is given in a theorem with the following statement.

```
Theorem F_fact_continuous :
  continuous (f_order Z Z)(f_order Z Z) F_fact.
```

Once the continuity proof is completed, we can define the function with a command of the following form:

```

Definition fact : Z -> option Z :=
  Tarski_fix F_fact F_fact_continuous.

```

Proving that functionals are continuous can be cumbersome, but they can usually be understood as the composite of elementary continuous functions, and composition can be shown to preserve continuity. The study of fragments of functional programming languages that we want to model makes it possible to isolate the various constructs that are used in all programs and generic proofs or tactics can be provided for all these constructs.

For instance we can define a continuous test function for tests on the type `bool`:

```

Definition cond (A :Set)
  (t:option bool)(v1 v2:option A) : option A :=
  match t with
  | None => None
  | Some true => v1
  | Some false => v2
  end.

```

and we can prove once and for all that this function will preserve the continuity of the function it combines, with a theorem of the following form:

```

Theorem cond_continuous :
  forall A B C t F G,
    continuous (f_order' A B) (f_order' A bool) t ->
    continuous (f_order' A B) (f_order' A C) F ->
    continuous (f_order' A B) (f_order' A C) G ->
    continuous (f_order' A B)(f_order' A C)
      (fun f x => cond (t f x) (F f x) (G f x)).

```

We believe that the same work can be done systematically for the pattern matching constructs that are associated with any other basic recursive type.

We can also define a function `Apply` that mimicks the application of a potentially non-terminating function to a value, also computed by a potentially non-terminating function. This is a possible definition:

```

Definition Apply (A B:Set)(f: option (A -> option B))
  (v:option A) : option B :=
  match v with
  | Some x => match f with Some f' => f' x | None => None end
  | None => None
  end.

```

This function can also be provided with a continuity statement, which we do not give here.

With these basic units, the code for our factorial example is convertible to the following one:

```

Definition F_fact2 : (Z -> option Z) -> Z -> option Z :=
  fun f z =>
    cond (Some (Zeq_bool z 0))
      (Some 1)
      (Apply (Some (fun v => Some (z*v))) (f (z - 1))).

```

and the proof that the function is continuous boils down to a traversal of the basic elements that are combined in the function, it only requires a few lines in our experiments.

Please note that the definition of the **Apply** function actually makes it precise and that we envision to compute with our potentially non-terminating functions in a “call-by-value” fashion, since the application of a function to an argument will fail if the computation of the argument is non-terminating. A different approach will be needed to model the execution of programs in a call-by-name strategy. However, we feel it is quite satisfactory that we can describe precisely when a program will fail to terminate for a given execution strategy.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss all the work that needs to be done to provide a usable package to reason about the continuity of functions. This was already done, for instance in [19,20,13] and their work can probably be re-used directly since we are now working in a classical framework, where the differences between HOL, Isabelle and type-theory based proof tools are less important. Still, we would like to avoid reconstructing data-types from first principles of domain theory as it is done in [13]. Although this work is impressive, we would like a smooth integration of the total functions already available in type theory with the potentially non-terminating functions.

4 Proving properties of functions

With the help Tarski’s least fix-point theorem we can now model a larger collection of functions. The new functions always return their result in an option type, what other authors called a pointed complete partial order or pcpo [13]. We can actually express that some function fails to terminate, simply by saying that the value it returns is the minimal element in the option type. We can also reason about the domain of definition and show that the function does return a regular value when the argument lies in a given domain, described by a predicate. For instance, we can follow Bove’s proposal to describe the function’s domain as an inductive predicate [4].

One key point in the definition of recursive functions is that they are presented as the *least fix-point* of the functional of interest. If we are considering a recursive function f defined from a functional F , this least fix-point is also the least upper bound of the sequence $u_n = F^n(\lambda x. \perp)$, and because the order in the target type is simplistic, we can prove that for every input of the recursive function such that $fx \neq \perp$, there exists a value a and a number n such that $F_n \lambda x. \perp = a$. This expresses that the value is indeed computed in a finite number of iterations. The theorem has the following statement (in this statement **iter** is

the function that computes $F^n(a)$ given the type on which F operates, F itself, the number n , and the initial value a .

```
Theorem Tarski_fix_iterates_witness :
  forall (A B:Set) (f : (A -> option B)->A -> option B)
    (Hct: continuous (f_order A B)(f_order A B) f)(x:A)(v:B),
    Tarski_fix f Hct x = Some v ->
    exists n, iter (A->option B) f n (fun a => None) x = Some v.
```

This theorem thus makes it possible to grab an inductive piece of data that *measures* the computation of the recursive function on some input when this computation terminates. This makes proofs by induction possible.

In one of our experiments we have defined the semantics of a small programming language in the spirit of [14]. We were able to use Tarski's fix-point theorem to describe the semantics of while loops as suggested in the book. We were then able to prove that when a value is returned, the same computation can be modeled by a natural semantics derivation, using an encoding of the natural semantics based on an inductive predicate. The experiment was also conducted in [15] with similar achievements.

We can also reason on non-terminating computations. The **witness** theorem above has a simple corollary for reasoning on non-termination:

```
Theorem iterates_none_imp_fix_none :
  forall A B f (Hct: continuous (f_order A B)(f_order A B) f) x,
  (forall n, iter _ f n (fun z => None) x = None) ->
  Tarski_fix f Hct x = None.
```

The two theorems together emulate the concept of fix-point induction as found in previous work.

For instance, to prove that our function **fact** will never terminate on negative inputs:

```
forall n, forall x, x < 0 ->
  iter _ F_fact n (fun z => None) x = None
```

This proof is done by induction on n . Note that the quantification over x is part of the statement that is proved by induction, this is necessary because x changes as the computation progresses, while remaining negative. This proof takes only a dozen steps.

Using the corollary on non-termination we can conclude with the following theorem:

```
Theorem fact_neg_none : forall x, x < 0 -> fact x = None.
```

Even though the machinery of the calculus of construction only accepts to compute with functions that are constructively guaranteed to terminate, we can still use the internal reduction mechanism to compute the value of our potentially non-terminating recursive function on well chose arguments. To achieve this trick, we simply need to use approximates computed with the help of the **iter**

function with an arbitrary number of iteration. If this number is chosen large enough, we may get an answer of the form `Some v`. In this case, we know that the value of the recursive function is an element of the target type `option B` that is larger than `Some v` for the order we are using. There are no other choices than the value `Some v` itself, so that we are actually guaranteed to have computed the right value. Of course, we may have chosen a value that is not large enough. In this case the value returned will be `None` and we cannot conclude. We don't know whether the recursive function actually diverges for this particular input or whether a larger number of iterations would have sufficed.

Still this kind of computation is very useful and may be used in reflexive tactics for example: it may be that to prove a certain fact we need to compute with a recursive function obtained through the least fix-point theorem. We can do so with a fixed number of iterations: if a regular value is returned, it is used in the proof attempt, if a \perp value is returned, this means the proof attempt fails to produce a result in the allocated time. So be it.

5 Extraction towards functional programming languages

One of the fine points of our experiment is the fact that we use a Σ -type form of the definite description axiom. This means that the extraction process may encounter uses of this axiom and will have the problem of finding a relevant piece of target code to produce for this axiom.

We have a solution to this problem. We contend that the extraction mechanism can still behave correctly if the axiom of definite description is not used elsewhere than in the proof of Tarski's fix-point theorem. On the other hand, it is better if this theorem itself is considered as an axiom, because there is a functional value that can represent it faithfully in conventional functional programming languages, without endangering the correctness of the extraction mechanism.

More precisely, we think that it is important to prove the Tarski's least fix-point theorem to make sure it relies only on well understood axioms; and we did just that in our experiments. But then, it should be replaced with a shadow of itself: an axiom with the same type but no value that the extraction mechanism can use. Then the extraction mechanism should be instructed to bind this axiom to a value in the target functional programming language, which describes exactly the computation of the fix-point of an arbitrary function with non-termination if needed. Here is an example of such a function, written in Ocaml syntax:

```
let rec tarski_fix f x = f (fun y -> tarski_fix f y) x
```

Please note that this definition clearly expresses that the function being defined is the fix-point of f . It also clearly expresses that this is only to be used for recursive functions (not for recursive non-functional values). Moreover, this one-line of code is carefully engineered to avoid falling in a non-terminating recursive loop, even in a call-by-value setting (as in Ocaml). In fact, `fun y -> tarski_fix f y`

is a function that is extensionally equal to `tarski_fix f`, except that its computation is deferred until it is really given an argument.

In the Coq system, here is how we treat the fix-point theorem: a first theorem is proved in the traditional setting (even without needing any classical logic axiom) This theorem has the following statement:

```
Tarski_least_fixpoint
: forall (A : Set) (R : A -> A -> Prop),
  (forall x : A, R x x) -> antisymmetric R -> complete R ->
  forall bot : A, (forall x : A, R bot x) ->
  forall f : A -> A, continuous R R f ->
  exists phi : A, least_fixpoint R f phi
```

This theorem cannot be used to construct values in the `Set` sort, so that it does not interfere with the extraction mechanism.

We then use the standard collection of classical axioms to prove that any space of the form $A \rightarrow_{\perp}$ forms a complete partial order. In particular, we need to have an axiom of extensionality to conclude on the property of antisymmetry and the axiom of excluded middle to establish the relation between least upper bounds of chains and least fix-points.

Once we have the complete partial order structure on function spaces, we instantiate the least fix-point theorem to this domain and we shift its existential quantification to a Σ -type, using the following form of the axiom of description:

```
Axiom dependent_description' :
  forall (A:Type) (B:A -> Type) (R:forall x:A, B x -> Prop),
  (forall x:A,
    exists y : B x, R x y /\
      (forall y':B x, R x y' -> y = y')) ->
  sigT (fun f : forall x:A, B x =>
    (forall x:A, R x (f x))).
```

The specialized theorem is called `Tarski_fix'` and its statement is the same as the statement of `Tarski_fix` which we already described in section 3. We prove a theorem `Tarski_fix'_prop`, with the same statement as `Tarski_fix_prop` to establish the relevant properties.

At this point we are satisfied with the proof of the theorem. We actually add the values `Tarski_fix` and `Tarski_fix_prop` as axioms (morally, they are harmless axioms since we know they can be proved). From then on, all the rest of our development only uses these axioms instead of the proofs.

We then instruct the extraction mechanism to map the axiom `Tarski_fix` to the well-chosen function. The directive is as follows.

```
Extract Constant Tarski_fix =>
  "let rec t f x = f (fun y -> t f y) x in t".
```

From then on, every function defined using `Tarski_fix` is correctly extracted to a recursive function. We claim that this function is guaranteed to compute

as predicted by the models we study in the calculus of constructions. In one of our experiments, we described the denotational semantics of a simple imperative programming language and proved it sound with respect to an natural semantics specification, in the spirit of [15,21]. Once extracted to ML, this gives a certified interpreter for the language.

There are two improvements that we can propose but for which we have not been able to produce an experiment. The first improvement is that the fix-point function should actually be inlined directly in every recursive function that is based on the least fix-point theorem. In the current situation, the extracted code for our `fact` function is a direct call to the `tarski_fix` function with a functional as first argument. Because of this every recursive call of the function we want to model is implemented with two recursive calls in the target language. Moreover, this precludes optimizations like tail-recursion optimisation.

The second improvement concerns useless pattern-matching constructs that are added in the code to mirror the pattern-matching constructs that appear in the calculus of constructions models to handle the possibility that functions may not terminate. These pattern-matching constructs appear as matchings on `option` types. They are useless because no function ever explicitly produces a `None` value, at least if the models are written with the discipline that `None` should be used only to represent failure to terminate and not other causes of failure. To avoid these useless pattern-matching constructs, we suggest that a specific type constructor, other than `option`, should be used to add a bottom element to types and the use of the bottom constructor from this specific type should be forbidden outside the bottom clauses of pattern-matching constructs on the values of types obtained by this new type constructor. Actually, this discipline can be verified syntactically by the extraction tool itself. In this manner, the pattern-matching constructs related to non-termination would still appear in the models, but they would be absent in the extracted code.

The intuition behind this improvement is that the bottom value is only produced at the end of all times by functions that do not terminate. It is safe to discard this possibility, because the eventuality of such a value really arising in a program will only happen at the end of all times, in other words, never.

6 Related work

The work described here contributes to all the work that has been made to ease the description and formal proofs about general recursive functions. A lot of efforts were put in providing relevant collections of inductive types equipped with terminating computation inspired from the notions of primitive recursion [5,17,1]. In particular, it was shown that the notion of accessibility or noetherian induction could be described using an inductive predicate with a single constructor in [16]. This accessibility predicate makes it possible to encode well-founded recursion, when one can prove that all elements of the input type satisfy the accessibility predicate for a well-chosen relation (such a relation is called well-founded). In practice, it requires ingenuity to find the right well-founded relation

for the function being considered. If it is not true that all elements are accessible (or if one cannot exhibit a well-founded relation that suits the function being defined), the recursive function may still be defined, but it will have a well-defined values only for the elements that can be proved to be accessible for some relation. This idea was further refined in [8,4], where termination is not described using an accessibility predicate, but directly with an inductive predicate that actually describes exactly those inputs for which the function terminates.

In previous work [2,3], we attempted to provide tools that stay closer to the level of expertise of programmers in conventional functional programming. The key point is to start from the recursive equation and to generate the recursive function definition from this equation. Users still need to prove that the recursive calls happen on predecessors of the initial input for a chosen well-founded relation, but these requirements appear as proof obligations that are generated as a complement of the recursive equation. The tool produces the recursive function and a proof of the recursive equation. The technique is also based on iterating the functional that occurs in the recursive equation, but no continuity argument is required (instead we use a well-founded relation). With respect to all this body of work, our work is original in that it concentrates on describing potentially non-terminating functions, not by adding extra input arguments to describe the domain, but by adding an element to the target type to denote non-termination.

We have only done the minimal amount of domain theory to just make it possible to define potentially non-terminating functions and perform basic reasoning steps on these functions. More complete studies of domain theory have been performed in the LCF system [19]. It was also formalized in Isabelle’s HOL instantiation to provide a package known as HOLCF [20,13]. We believe these other experiments can give us guidelines to make it easier for programmers to prove the continuity requirements.

In early version of the Calculus of constructions, formalizations of Tarski’s least fixpoint theorem were also used to show how inductive definitions could be encoded directly in the pure (impredicative) calculus of constructions [10]. In this respect, it is also worthwhile to mention that [9] shows how this theorem can be used to give a definitional justification of inductive type in higher-order logic.

7 Conclusion

There is a popular belief that type-theory based proof tools can only be used to reason on functions that are total and terminating for all inputs, because termination of reductions is needed to ensure the consistency of these system. One of the contribution of this paper is to fight this belief by providing yet another way to model potentially non-terminating functions. To do so we re-use Tarski’s least fix-point theorem, a well-known theorem of domain theory.

In this paper, there are three claims that deserve a closer look. The first claim is that users of type-theory based theorem provers should relax their attachment to constructive mathematics and accept non-constructive axioms that do not

endanger the consistency of the logical system. Actually, it is high time that a comprehensive set of axioms should be designed to make it possible to mix type theory (with the advantage that it contains a quite efficient reduction mechanism that makes it possible to compute directly in the logical framework) and classical higher-order logic (with the advantage of representing more directly the usual concepts of mathematics). We believe our paper is the first to show the direct link between the non-constructive domain theory for computable functions and extraction capabilities.

The second claim we make and should be scrutinized is that modeling an arbitrary recursive function is tractable in the setting we propose. In particular, we have been very quick on the problem of proving continuity, but this continuity problem may be the really difficulty of this approach. We hope that the existing body of work on formalized domain theory can be of use here.

The third claim we make is that Tarski's least fix-point theorem is faithfully realized by the little functional value that we have described. We have given little arguments for this claim and we wonder whether a formal proof of this statement could be made, for instance by relying on a formal description of the target language's semantics and proving that computations in this formal setting do terminate when models compute to a regular value different from \perp .

Acknowledgments

Benjamin Werner and Hugo Herbelin played a significant role in understanding what form of the axioms of classical logic provide safe extensions of the calculus of constructions. This work also benefited from early experiments by Kuntal Das Barman and suggestions by P. Aczel. The author also wishes to remember the late Gilles Kahn, who started work on formalizing domain theory in the context of the calculus of inductive constructions in 1996 [11].

References

1. Peter Aczel. An introduction to inductive definitions. In J. Barwise, editor, *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*, volume 90 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North Holland, 1977.
2. Antonia Balaa and Yves Bertot. Fonctions récursives générales par itération en théorie des types. In *Journées Francophones pour les Langages Applicatifs*, January 2002.
3. Yves Bertot and Pierre Castéran. *Interactive theorem proving and program development, Coq'art: the calculus of inductive constructions*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science: an EATCS series. Springer-Verlag, 2004.
4. A. Bove. General recursion in type theory. In H. Geuvers and F. Wiedijk, editors, *Types for Proofs and Programs, International Workshop TYPES 2002, The Netherlands*, number 2646 in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 39–58, March 2003.
5. Juanito Camilleri and Tom Melham. Reasoning with inductively defined relations in the HOL theorem prover. Technical report, University of Cambridge, 1992.

6. Laurent Chicli, Loïc Pottier, and Carlos Simpson. Mathematical quotients and quotient types in Coq. In H. Geuvers and F. Wiedijk, editors, *Types for Proofs and Programs*, number 2646 in LNCS, pages 95–107. Springer, 2003.
7. Coq development team. *The Coq Proof Assistant Reference Manual, version 8.0*, 2004.
8. Catherine Dubois and Véronique Viguié Donzeau-Gouge. A step towards the mechanization of partial functions: domains as inductive predicates, July 1998. www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~mmk/cade98-partiality.
9. John Harrison. Inductive definitions: Automation and application. In P. J. Windley, T. Schubert, and J. Alves-Foss, editors, *Higher Order Logic Theorem Proving and Its Applications: Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop*, volume 971 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, 1995.
10. Gérard Huet. Induction principles formalized in the calculus of constructions. In *TAPSOFT'87*, volume 249 of LNCS, pages 276–286. Springer, 1987.
11. Gilles Kahn. Elements of constructive geometry group theory and domain theory, 1995. available as a Coq user contribution at <http://coq.inria.fr/contribs-eng.html>.
12. Pierre Letouzey. A new extraction for Coq. In Herman Geuvers and Freek Wiedijk, editors, *TYPES 2002*, volume 2646 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
13. Olaf Müller, Tobias Nipkow, David von Oheimb, and Oskar Slotosch. HOLCF = HOL + LCF. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 9:191–223, 1999.
14. Hanne Riis Nielson and Flemming Nielson. *Semantics with Applications: A Formal Introduction*. Wiley, 1992.
15. Tobias Nipkow. Winskel is (almost) right: towards a mechanized semantics textbook. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 10:171–186, 1998.
16. Bengt Nordström. Terminating general recursion. *BIT*, 28, 1988.
17. Christine Paulin-Mohring. Inductive Definitions in the System Coq - Rules and Properties. In M. Bezem and J.-F. Groote, editors, *Proceedings of the conference Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*, number 664 in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 1993. LIP research report 92-49.
18. Christine Paulin-Mohring and Benjamin Werner. Synthesis of ML programs in the system Coq. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 15:607–640, 1993.
19. Lawrence C. Paulson. *Logic and computation, Interactive proof with Cambridge LCF*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
20. Franz Regensburger. HOLCF: Higher order logic of computable functions. In P. J. Windley, T. Schubert, and J. Alves-Foss, editors, *Higher Order Logic Theorem Proving and Its Applications: Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop*, volume 971 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, 1995.
21. Glynn Winskel. *The Formal Semantics of Programming Languages, an introduction*. Foundations of Computing. The MIT Press, 1993.